

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-14, 16 and 18 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of March 9, 2007, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating therein the subject matter of claim 9. Claims 9, 15, 17 and 19 have been cancelled. Minor amendments have been made to claims 3-8, 10-14, 16 and 18.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 3-19 are objected to because the numbers following the various components recited in the claims are said to be unnecessary, and claim 8 contains a square symbol instead of a degree symbol in the last line.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, 16 and 18 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. Claims 15, 17 and 19 have been cancelled.

The Examiner has suggested that "hole- and electron-transporting substances" be changed to "hole-transporting and electron-transporting substances." Claims 1, 8 and 14 have been so amended.

Additionally, claim 8 has been amended to insert a degree symbol for the square.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 9, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states that the claims are indefinite because the claims from which they depend do not set forth a "hole injection layer."

As claims 9, 15, 17 and 19 have been cancelled, this rejection is now moot. The subject matter of claim 9 has been incorporated into claim 1, with the addition to claim 1 of "a hole injection layer" and "said hole injection layer consisting of a copper phthalocyanine."

Art Rejections

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori et al., US 6,285,039 in view of Satsuki et al., US 2005/0275341.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. As the subject matter of claim 9 has been incorporated into claim 1, and thus into the claims dependent therefrom. As claim 9 has not been rejected as unpatentable over Kobori in view of Satsuki, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 10-13, 16 and 18 are allowable.

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori in view of Satsuki and further in view of Inoue et al., US 5,635,308.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The subject matter of claim 9, which has not been rejected as being unpatentable over these cited patents, has been incorporated into claim 1. Since claims 8 and 14 include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 14 are allowable.

Claims 9, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori in view of Satsuki in further view of Van Slyke et al., *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **69(15)**, 1996, pp. 2160-2162.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner alleges that Van Slyke teach in analogous art the improvement in stability in a device by adding copper phthalocyanine as a hole injection contact layer. However, Van Slyke does not teach a hole injection layer that consists

of copper phthalocyanine, whose variation in diffraction peak accompanied by heating the organic EL device at ambient temperature is maintained with in $\pm 25\%$. Further, the changes in crystalline state of organic materials can be reduced to a level which causes no short-circuit and electric leakage when used under higher temperature conditions. This feature is quite advantageous when an organic EL device as claimed herein is used in a display equipped in an automobile, the room temperature of which may increase to over 50°C in the summer.

None of Kobori, Satsuki, or Slyke teaches the advantages of the specific copper phthalocyanine membrane used as a hole injection layer.

Claims 9, 15, 17 and 19 have been cancelled. The subject matter of claim 9 has been incorporated into claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is not obvious over Kobori in view of Satsuki in further view of Van Slyke.

Claims 1-7, 10-13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori in view of Fujiwara et al., *Journal of Photopolymer Science and Technology*, 15(2), 2002, pp. 237-238.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is noted that claim 9 is not included in this rejection. Since

the limitations of claim 9 have now been incorporated into claim 1, and claims 2-7, 10-13, 16 and 18 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are not obvious over the combination of Kobori in view of Fujiwara.

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori in view of Fujikawa in further view of Inoue.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is noted that claim 9 is not included in this rejection. Since the limitations of claim 9 have now been incorporated into claim 1, and claims 8 and 14 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are not obvious over the combination of Kobori in view of Fujiwara and further in view of Inoue.

Claims 9, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobori in view of Fujiwara in further view of Van Slyke.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. As noted above, none of Kobori, Fujikawa or Van Slyke teaches the advantage of the specific copper phthalocyanine membrane are recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that claim 1 as amended is now patentable. Claims 15, 17 and 19 have been canceled.

Appln. No. 10/545,165
Amd. dated June 11, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2007

It is noted that the prior art of record and not
relied upon is merely considered to be pertinent to
applicant's disclosure.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted
that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and
favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: /Anne M. Kornbau/
Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:srd
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\S\SUMA\KOJIMA3\pto\2007-06-11 AMD.doc